

Serial No. 10/697,626

Filing Date: October 30, 2003

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-18, 21-26, 28-29, 31-32 and 35, 37-42 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 10-15, 22, 24-26, 31, 32, 35, and 37-39 have been amended, Claims 8 and 36 have been canceled, and Claims 41 and 42 have been added to claim additional subject matter in the specification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the pending Claims in view of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph

Claims 1, 11-15, 22, 24-26, 31-32, 35, and 38-39 was rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention because the claims include the term "audio." Applicant has amended each of the claims to remove the term "audio."

Claim 37 was rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being indefinite for including the term "about." Claim 37 has been amended to remove the term "about."

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph rejection of these claims.

Claim Rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 15, 21-26, 28, 32, 36 and 37 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,598,480 to Kim (hereinafter "Kim") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,097,223 to Alexander (hereinafter "Alexander") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,670,709 to Iredale (hereinafter "Iredale"). Claims 2, 3, 16 and 17 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, in view of Alexander, in view of Iredale and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,504,704 to Oyaba (hereinafter "Oyaba"). Claims 4, 5 and 18 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, in view of Alexander, in view of Iredale and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,751,738 to Widrow et al. (hereinafter "Widrow"). Claims 6, 7 10-13, and 29 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, in view of Alexander, in view of Iredale and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,533,135 to Gary (hereinafter "Gary"). Claim 14 was rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Iredale and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0101153 to Grudin (hereinafter "Grudin"). Claims 35, 38 and 40 were rejected pursuant

Serial No. 10/697,626

Filing Date: October 30, 2003

to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, in view of Alexander, in view of Iredale and further in view of Microelectronics Circuits by Adel S. Sedra, Oxford University Press 1998, pgs. 668-671 and Figure 8.1.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include the limitations described in dependent Claim 8, and Claim 8 has been canceled. Claim 8 was indicated as allowable if placed in independent form. Thus, Claim 1 is now allowable.

Claim 15 has been amended to describe the steps of sensing a current on the output with a current monitor, and setting an output impedance of the power amplifier with a current feedback circuit included in the power amplifier based on the sensed current. None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, describe sensing a current on an output with a current monitor, and setting an output impedance of a power amplifier based the sensed current as described in Claim 15.

Claim 26 has been amended to describe that the amplification means further comprises a current monitoring means for monitoring current on the output, and feedback means for generating a feedback signal to set the output impedance as function of the monitored current. None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, describe a current monitoring means for monitoring current, and a feedback means for generating a feedback signal to set the output impedance as a function of the monitored current as described in Claim 26.

Claim 32 describes the step of configuring an output impedance of a current-feedback amplifier with a feedback signal, to be within the operational range of the input impedance of the driver circuit, where the feedback signal is generated based on an output current of the current-feedback amplifier that is being monitored with a current monitor. None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, describe configuring an output impedance of a current-feedback amplifier with a feedback signal that is generated based on an output current of the current-feedback amplifier that is being monitored with a current monitor.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 15, 26 and 32 and the claims dependent therefrom should be withdrawn since all of the limitations described are not taught, suggested or disclosed by the cited prior art, either alone or in combination and a *prima facie* case of obviousness can no longer be maintained. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-7, 10-18, 21-26, 28-29, 31-32 and 35, 37-40.


With this amendment and response, the present pending claims of this application are in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a Notice of

Serial No. 10/697,626

Filing Date: October 30, 2003

Allowance for this application. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution/allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (317) 636-0886.

Respectfully submitted,



Sanders N. Hillis
Attorney for Applicant
Attorney Reg. No. 45,712

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
Customer Number 27879
Telephone: 317-636-0886